

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-18 were pending. Claims 2-4 and 17 are amended, claims 1, 5-8, 13-16, and 18 are cancelled, and new claims 19-31 are added. Support for the new claims may be found throughout the application as filed; no new matter is entered.

Claim Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for not reciting subject matter that has a tangible result. Claims 1, 5-8, 13-16 and 18 are cancelled, so their rejection is moot. The other rejected claims depend from claim 19, which defines a tangible apparatus in the form of a computer system. Applicant asks the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as reciting subject matter anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0002474 to Michelson et al.

Applicant asks the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection because Michelson does not teach, for each claim, every element in the recited arrangement.

Claim 1 has been canceled, and the uncanceled claims depending from it have been amended to depend from claim 19. Claim 19 requires a security layer that prevents direct communication between the server and the matcher. Michelson does not describe such a security layer. At most, Michelson refers vaguely to creating a “secure environment;” it does not describe providing a security layer to control the flow of information to and from the server and the matcher.

Claim 17, as amended, requires registering a patient only after that patient has first supplied an answer to a clinical trial eligibility question. Michelson, in contrast, repeatedly emphasizes that patients are first registered before being allowed to access the matching system. See, for example, Michelson paragraph [0090], which discusses requiring patients to register with the system and expressly agree to terms and conditions for using the system. While Michelson's Fig. 7D shows a flowchart in which a patient is registered after a "trial match," there is no indication that the match is carried out on the basis of a patient's answer(s) to clinical trial eligibility question(s).

Respectfully submitted,
Foley Hoag LLP

DATE: September 25, 2006

Customer No. 25181
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Tel.: (617) 832-1241
Fax: (617) 832-7000

Scott E. Kamholz
Reg. No. 48,543
Attorney for Applicant